

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY

Council of the Faculty of Arts and Science

Minutes of the meeting held on Monday, May 13, 1991

- Present:** C.L. Bertrand; M. Yates; B. Harris; P. Albert; S. Ruby; F. Stevens; C. White; J. Appleby; P. Widden; M. Brian; Z. Hamlet; E. Preston; G. Kanaan; B. Lewis; D. Shapiro; G. Fisher; G. Auchinachie; C. Lévy; R. Kilgour; R. Perigoe; J. Locke; M. Shames; W. Byers; A. Teffeteller; R. Sharma; N. Segalowitz; S. Hoecker-Drysdale; J. Snyder; K. Clément; H. Danakas; J. Serruya; T. Taylor.
- Regrets:** M. Szabo; M. Barlow; M.G. Decarie; M. Oppenheim; M. Taylor.
- Absent:** T. Swift; J. Gavin; W. Knitter; H. McQueen; G.P. Sassano; M. Armstrong; H. Shulman; C. Gray; M. Poirier; G. Newsham; C. Potworowski; S. Lanthier-O'Connor; G. Bastien; E. Budik; L. Cohen; J. Drolet; S. Farber; R. Gotlieb; G. Grougrou; J. Gruman; E. Kalantar; B. Leonhardt; P. Richards.

Documents Distributed and Considered at this meeting:

- | | |
|---------------------|---|
| ASFC 91-5M-A | Election/Ratification - Arts and Science Faculty Committees |
| ASFC 91-5M-B | Faculty of Arts and Science Curriculum Committee Report 71U - Credits for Courses with Statistical Content |
| ASFC 91-5M-C | Faculty of Arts and Science Curriculum Committee Report 72U - New Undergraduate Programme - Certificate in Community and Ethnic Studies |
| ASFC 91-5M-D | Report 80 - Departmental Evaluations, 80-1A Philosophy; 80-2A Physics |
| ASFC 91-5M-E | Effect of Interdisciplinary restriction of SIP programs on the Department of Biology |

1. Call to Order

Dean Bertrand called the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

- 91-5M-1 It was moved and seconded (Hamlet/Shames) that the Agenda be approved as circulated.
- 91-5M-2 It was moved and seconded (Stevens/Ruby) that Item 8 on the Agenda be withdrawn.

Carried.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting held March 15, 1991

- 91-5M-3 It was moved and seconded (Levy/Shames) that the minutes of the Arts and Science Faculty Council meeting held March 15, 1991, be approved as circulated.

Dr. Shames asked that the first paragraph on page 9 be placed between the sixth and seventh paragraphs on page 9 (between Bertrand and Decarie).

Carried.

4. Remarks from the Chair

Dean Bertrand referred to the meeting of Council in the Committee of the Whole which discussed space and the ramifications of the Strategic Space Plan for Arts and Science and reminded Council that he would welcome comments and briefs from departments within the Faculty. Although he had received a few reports he would welcome a much wider input.

Dean Bertrand also mentioned to Council that the Dean and the Chair whose resignation had been requested were able to work out a mutually agreeable solution and that the request had been withdrawn.

5. Questions and Announcements

Dr. Auchinachie said that the Dean had instructed Chairs to request information and/or documentation from the Strategic Space Committee; he had written two or three weeks ago to the committee but as yet had received no reply.

Dean Bertrand promised to look into the delay. He mentioned that although Vice-Dean Albert might have some information that would be helpful to departments, he felt that the Strategic Space Committee was the logical place from which to request this information.

6. Nominations/Ratification - Arts and Science Faculty Committees

Dean Bertrand made the following announcements:

Notice of Meeting to be held May 21, 1991 at 10:00 a.m. - ratification of graduating student lists - we must have a quorum.

Notice of Election at the meeting of May 21, 1991 at 10:00 a.m. The Dean's Office would continue to receive nominations until Wednesday, May 15th, 1991.

Notice of Election of an additional member for the Computer Resources Committee, for a 1-year term (a sabbatical replacement).

7. Effect of Interdisciplinary restriction of SIP programs on the Department of Biology

Dean Bertrand asked if Dr. Widden would start the discussion regarding the concerns of the Department of Biology on the recent move by the Board of Graduate Studies regarding the SIP program.

Dr. Widden said that the motion was prompted by a decision taken by the Board of Graduate Studies to restrict the SIP program to interdisciplinary programs only. Biology's Ph.D. proposal was being considered in Quebec at the present time and the Biology Department had used the SIP to bring Ph.D. students (12 at present) into the program. Had this been restricted to interdisciplinary programs, Biology would not have any Ph.D. students. The department had restricted entry to quality students with external funds. In fact, the SIP had given the department credibility in bringing their Ph.D. proposal to Quebec. The Department of Biology had been given permission to maintain the status quo for another year. He felt that the Faculty and other departments with future plans to mount Ph.D. programs should be aware that this could affect them in future.

91-5M-3 It was moved and seconded (Widden/Levy) that the recent recommendation, passed by the Board of Graduate Studies, that the SIP programme be used only for interdisciplinary programmes, could have an enormous, detrimental effect on some departments in Arts and Science and should therefore be reconsidered.

Dr. Shames asked if there were other departments using the SIP program in this way.

Dr. Widden was not sure and asked if the Department of Mathematics and Statistics had a similar problem with the SIP program.

Dr. Byers responded that students in the Mathematics Department had an option to use the interdisciplinary feature by having their theses encompass Physics or another science. Dr. Byers was at the BGS meeting where this resolution was passed. This resolution seemed to be a decision against the idea of incubator programs, and single discipline programs. Dr. Byers did not recall that there was a great deal of debate at BGS. He recalled that the committee which looked at the SIP program, which Dr. Albert chaired, did not recommend what was passed at BGS. There was a feeling that by having the SIP program, departments would not be encouraged to develop their own doctoral programs. On the other hand, it seemed to him that this was a fairly drastic way to deal with the problem. The Department of Mathematics and Statistics' experience with the SIP program was that it was very loosely administered and that there was very little in the way of uniform standards across the board. Dr. Byers would have preferred BGS to refer this issue back to Faculty Councils for their input. He was afraid that this would damage departments trying to get a doctoral program going.

Dr. Auchinachie spoke in support of Dr. Widden's motion. He informed Council that interdisciplinary Ph.D. degrees in English generally went through the Ph.D. Humanities. They had used the SIP only on rare occasion. He felt that the BGS resolution was an unnecessary regulation and should be withdrawn.

Dean Bertrand explained that a Ph.D. in Humanities was precisely that. Consequently, Mathematics and Biology students had difficulty fitting into that particular Ph.D. The SIP program's problem was that, using Mathematics and Biology as examples, these were programs which should probably have had their own Ph.D. programs ten years ago. For a variety of reasons, they didn't. One reason may be that it was just as easy to use the SIP program. The Master's in Women's Studies was another example where about 12-15 people have graduated, all under the SIP when there was every reason to have a legitimate M.A. in Women's Studies. The feeling at BGS was that departments capable of mounting their own graduate degrees should be pushed to do that and not be allowed to rely on the SIP program. If the BGS decision was intended to end incubator programs, then it ought to be looked at again, and Dr. Widden's motion suggested that BGS should take a second look at their resolution.

Dr. Shames asked if it was possible for the motion to be rendered less absolute. Could Council ask that SIP be used "primarily" for interdisciplinary programs.

Ms. Taylor wanted to know what SIP stood for and who conferred the degree.

Dean Bertrand explained that the university conferred all degrees. SIP degrees would read, Special Individual Program, Doctor of Philosophy in Biology, or Special Individual Program, Doctor of Philosophy in Mathematics. SIP programs were arranged through the Office of the Dean of Graduate Studies.

Dr. Byers suggested that BGS be asked to review its decision for a number of reasons. He queried the meaning of "single" discipline or "interdisciplinary" pointing out that in Mathematics there were cases, such as at the University of Waterloo where there was a Department of Pure Mathematics, a Department of Applied Mathematics, a Department of Statistics, and a Department of Computer Science. So "interdisciplinary" in the context of the University of Waterloo was not the same as "interdisciplinary" at Concordia. What constituted "interdisciplinarity"? He suggested that it should be based on the student's work and not on the student's department. He felt that the SIP should not be used within any one department to graduate Ph.D. students as the quality control was not there. Some of the feedback from Quebec was that Concordia had a back door by which to graduate Ph.D. students so it was not as vital to give Concordia new programs because there was another avenue for awarding Ph.D's. He noted that he was in favour of reviewing BGS's decision but also of keeping very strong control.

Dr. Albert said that the recommendation from the SIP appraisal committee was to recognize that BGS had approved the SIP in order to admit a restricted number of students to the program but over the years some departments had admitted a larger number of students than was intended. The committee recommended that BGS tighten regulations concerning the regular SIP as some departments used it as an incubator program which was never the original intention. It was recommended that BGS should reconsider what was happening and formulate a new set of guidelines with respect to incubator programs. The external evaluator recommended very strongly that the incubator nature of the SIP be used to advantage, as it was an excellent way to develop graduate programs. It was recommended that more guidelines and tighter regulations be developed. BGS decided to cut out the incubator programs outright and a subsequent committee of BGS looked at tightening up the regulations.

Dr. Segalowitz proposed that in order to get around the Catch 22 situation, BGS should be asked to consider loosening the restrictions of the SIP program in a certain context, as for example where a department was planning to make a proposal for a graduate program further down the road. In these cases BGS should be sympathetic in order to allow those programs to develop a track record. In a case where a department did not have any such plan, then perhaps BGS should be less sympathetic.

Dean Bertrand proposed to attend the next meeting of BGS to explain the thinking of Council more fully and its concern about incubator programs and inform BGS that Council endorsed the report of the appraisal committee but asked that BGS should rework its own motion. It should take the appraisal report into consideration and ensure that incubator programs were available under the SIP program.

- 91-5M-3** **It was moved and seconded (Widden/Levy) that the recent recommendation, passed by the Board of Graduate Studies, that the SIP programme be used only for interdisciplinary programmes, could have an enormous, detrimental effect on some departments in Arts and Science and should therefore be reconsidered.**

Carried.

9. New Undergraduate Programme - Report 72U; Certificate in Community and Ethnic Studies

Dean Bertrand asked Dr. Stevens to introduce Report 72U.

Dr. Stevens informed Council that this was the only undergraduate curriculum change being put forward at this meeting. The other changes would be put forward in the fall to be ready for inclusion in next year's calendar.

- 91-5M-4** **It was moved and seconded (F. Stevens/S. Hoecker-Drysdale) that Report 72U, New Undergraduate Programme "Certificate in Community and Ethnic Studies" be approved.**

Dr. Stevens explained that the development of this new certificate program was due to the award of an endowed chair to be shared with UQAM. Dr. Stevens asked that Dr. de Vries and Dr. Talai from the Department of Sociology and Anthropology be given speaking privileges to describe the program and also to respond to questions.

Speaking privileges were so granted.

Dr. de Vries said that the certificate program in Community and Ethnic Studies was prepared along with a proposal for a Major in Community and Ethnic Studies which would go to the appropriate committees in the fall. These were not envisaged by the department when it prepared a long-range planning document in 1987. The Department of Sociology and Anthropology had committed itself to the expansion of its graduate programs. The proposal before Council and the

proposal for a Major represented their response to an urgent request from the Faculty of Arts and Science to develop these programs. The department had a full range of relevant courses in the two disciplines, Anthropology and Sociology. Also, the department had already created a Centre for Community and Ethnic Studies. They could, therefore, make available both the courses and the organizational structure of the Centre to mount these programs. However, the expansion of the graduate program and the undergraduate restructuring would seriously tax departmental resources in terms of both faculty and support staff. The department would therefore require at least one additional faculty position and sufficient financial resources for the Centre to administer these programs.

Ms Clément asked whether students would be involved in the discussion on restructuring.

Dr. de Vries responded that the department had just begun discussions to shift the focus to the graduate program when they were asked to develop this undergraduate program and that students would be asked for their input.

Dr. Levy asked if there was assurance of another faculty position for the department.

Dean Bertrand responded that the department did not have a Certificate in Community and Ethnic Studies in its long term plan. Therefore, the Faculty of Arts and Science did not have another faculty position for the Department of Sociology and Anthropology related to a Certificate in Community and Ethnic Studies in its long term plans either. The Faculty of Arts and Science asked the department to put together a certificate program as quickly as possible in response to a request from another body within the university. The dean expressed pride in the department for coming up with what was academically, such a respectable program in a very short period of time. The dean noted that with the resources at hand everything could not be accomplished. He intended to go to SCAPP and to Senate to request a commitment from the Vice Rector, Institutional Relations and Finance, for a new faculty position for this program. If the support was not forthcoming from the university, then this program could not be offered. The Faculty did not have the resources at the present time and the dean was unwilling to rob another department.

Dr. Levy asked about ANTH 308, he wish to know what was meant by "Otherness in a Cross-cultural Perspective and ANTH 322 - Pre-Colonial Kingdoms of Africa. He remarked that he had noted course offerings that referred to the Aboriginal Indian, the Innu and African peoples but no mention of anything Asian.

Dr. Talai assured Dr. Levy that there was no intention of leaving anything out.

The courses listed were present course offerings in the Calendar. In addition it was also proposed that other courses be chosen from outside the department in consultation with the student's advisor.

She further explained that "Otherness" was a very important term at the present time in Sociology and Anthropology which referred to the cultural and social concept of boundaries and a sense of differences between people.

Professor Brian expressed her support of what was a very timely and comprehensive proposal and supported the Dean in his search for money to fund it and congratulated all concerned with the development of it.

Dr. Gray asked if the conjunction with UQAM was solely in sharing the Chair. He wondered whether this program was uniquely a Concordia program.

Dr. de Vries said that only the Chair would be shared. This program was a Concordia program although there may be other ramifications. He himself was not sure what sharing a chair meant. Dean Bertrand commented that if each university got an undergraduate program going with a shared Chair, it was logical to think that a joint graduate program might be a step later on.

Dr. Auchinachie hoped that we were not going to proliferate certificates and asked was there not a stance at Concordia that getting heavily into certificates should be avoided.

Dr. Stevens pointed out that this certificate program was in answer to two certificates at UQAM and assured Council that it would answer a need of CLSCs, hospitals and social workers. A Major was also being considered but it required more preparation and would be presented in the fall.

Dean Bertrand assured Council that the arrangement would not evolve as at the French universities, where, if a student completed three certificates worth 90 credits, a degree would automatically be granted. There was nothing against adding certificate programs where there was a need, and obviously in this circumstance there was justification and a need.

91-5M-4 It was moved and seconded (F. Stevens/S. Hoecker-Drysdale) that Report 72U, New Undergraduate Programme "Certificate in Community and Ethnic Studies" be approved.

Carried.

10. Departmental Evaluations

91-5M-5 **It was moved and seconded (F. Stevens/E. Preston) that Report 80, Departmental Evaluations 80-1A Philosophy and 80-2A Physics be accepted as circulated.**

Dr. Stevens reported to Council that last May, Faculty Council had approved a motion by Dr. Dicks to evaluate programs in the Faculty at the undergraduate level. She announced that two pilot projects in the Departments of Philosophy and Physics were now completed and thanked these Departments for their cooperation and hard work.

In October, Dr. Stevens met with each department, separately, and reviewed procedures for self-evaluation and presented them with guidelines. Each department was asked to form a committee consisting of faculty and students from the department as well as a faculty member from a cognate department. The services of the office of Institutional Planning and Research, the Learning and Development Office and Grendon Haines' for organizational advice, were offered. The committees worked on their report and submitted them to their own departmental councils for approval. They were then submitted to Dr. Stevens in January for review by the Faculty Curriculum Committee.

Dr. Stevens thanked the members of the Faculty Curriculum Committee, (Professor Mary Brian (MATH), Dr. Nelson Eddy (PHYS), Professor Anne Galler (LIBS), Dr. Dan Otchere (ECON), Professor Eileen Preston (CLAS), Dr. Eyvind Ronquist (ENGL), and student member, Glen Bastien) for the expertise they brought to the task, their careful deliberations and their devotion to duty. The Committee met weekly from January, sometimes meeting all day. The Faculty Curriculum Committee worked such long hours this past year because they needed to develop guidelines for its role in evaluating these reports. They wanted to keep several things in mind - fairness, a reasonable pragmatism, what was possible, and a spirit of commitment to the value of the evaluation process. The Committee also wanted dialogue with the departments and a reasoned evaluation of their findings.

After reviewing the departmental submissions, the Faculty Curriculum Committee compiled a descriptive report (Reports 80-1A and 80-2A), and a one-page summary of guidelines to be used by the Faculty Curriculum Committee for departmental evaluation. At present the Vice Rector, Academic was also holding discussions about the self-appraisal processes and intended to submit a document to Senate on periodic and cyclical self-appraisal processes.

Dr. Stevens reported to Council that the exercise had been very successful both for the departments and for the Faculty Curriculum Committee. Other departments had asked to be put on the list for self-evaluation for next year. Dr. Stevens said that subsequent notification of departments to undergo evaluation

would be announced at the May meetings of Faculty Council to give departments the summer to think about the process. Departments slated to undergo self-evaluation next year were Classics, Economics, Education, Exercise Science, Religion, and Sociology and Anthropology. This exercise would encourage departments to look at its programs and its curriculum, its faculty, students, staff and resources; to examine what it was doing and why, and to decide what it could do better; to see where it had been and where it wanted to go. The second part of the report - the evaluative report - would be presented in the fall. Dr. Stevens urged departments undergoing evaluation in the fall to contact her.

Ms Clément asked what input students had in the process besides course evaluations; she wondered if a student with a specific concern could bring it to Dr. Stevens. Dr. Stevens replied that concerns should be brought to the departmental committees in the first instance or to the student representative on Faculty Curriculum Committee and to her, only as a last resort.

Dean Bertrand asked if the Physics and Philosophy departmental committees had students on them.

Dr. Stevens responded that the committee in the Department of Philosophy did.

Dean Bertrand urged departments to ensure that one or two students were part of the evaluation committees.

Dr. Levy asked what was expected to happen to the reports after approval by Faculty Council.

Dr. Stevens replied that the report to Faculty Council was for information only. The purpose of these evaluations was for the department itself to make changes, if it so desired, and ultimately, to aid in strategic planning.

Dr. Knitter stated that at the next meeting of Senate a document will be tabled asking for approval in principle of the idea of evaluation. There were two elements that were unclear; one was that the department's whole offering would be evaluated - graduate and undergraduate and secondly there was the promise of guidelines. Since the guidelines were not yet finalized and the graduate and undergraduate appraisals had a different schedule, how were the efforts started here going to be meshed with those of Senate.

Dr. Stevens said that the Vice Rector, Academic's cycle will get going in the near future. She was pleased that Arts and Science had taken this step and was going forward. In some cases undergraduate and graduate evaluations would be meshed. This happened this year with the Physics department and will happen next year with Economics. At this early stage it was difficult to mesh everything.

Dr. Knitter asked if the Physics and Philosophy representatives at Council would report if the departments found the process worthwhile and in what ways.

Dr. Sharma said that the Department of Physics was very suspicious when Dr. Stevens met with the department last fall, however, Dr. Stevens handled the situation very well. Dr. Sharma found the committee to be extremely helpful. He would encourage departments to participate in the undergraduate program evaluation exercise. He was against the project in the beginning but was now a convert.

Dr. Gray reported that the Department of Philosophy looked forward to the project with a great deal of enthusiasm, in particular, because of the great usefulness of the recent graduate appraisal. In both cases it was helpful for development and direction within the confines of the department's resources. In general, the outcome of it was not as useful as the last graduate appraisal but the first two graduate appraisals were not as useful as the last. One of the outcomes was the pleasant surprise that the program compared well with others at several universities. Another discovery was that in acquainting themselves with the assessment literature and its use it became apparent that the program needed to have a design in order to be assessed by the literature. The overall design of this was very much in context of management by objectives; this is what you said you were going to do and whether you had done it. The absence of a mission statement delayed the process. The recommendation that emerged pointed to a reintroduction or reemphasising of certain areas of their curriculum. Another of the discoveries made in the course of it, was the startling amount of information available to departments by Institutional Research. Initially, it was difficult to identify exactly what information the department needed to know about itself in order to say something about itself and then to try to find the information. He thanked Dr. Stevens for the opportunity and help.

Dean Bertrand said that it would be useful to place the question of evaluation in context. The Vice Rectors, Academic, in their meetings as an arm of CREPUQ have come up with a document calling for appraisal of undergraduate programs in an attempt to outflank the Ministry which was making noises about the need to have appraisal of all programs, undergraduate and graduate and to try to make certain that the universities kept control of the appraisal system rather than to let the Ministry of Education take control of it. He expressed his pleasure that Arts and Science Faculty Council had the foresight to initiate a process ahead of what was going to Senate as one of the things Senate will have to take into account now would be what happened in the pilot projects in the Faculty of Arts and Science. It was important to view this evaluation as a positive and beneficial experience rather than a negative one. He was pleased to hear that, by and large, the two departments, Physics and Philosophy found it to be positive. He hoped that this exercise would continue along those positive lines.

Dean Bertrand thanked Vice Dean Stevens and the Faculty Curriculum Committee and the Departments of Philosophy and Physics for their roles. He reminded Council that the report was for information only but that a number of things would now happen either at the Dean's or the department's level. The process would not end with the report being presented to Council.

- 91-5M-5** It was moved and seconded (F. Stevens/E. Preston) that Report 80, Departmental Evaluations 80-1A Philosophy and 80-2A Physics be accepted as circulated.

Carried.

11. Other Business

Dean Bertrand informed Council that he had spent two days attending a meeting of Canadian Deans of Science and another two days attending a meeting of Canadian Deans of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences. He said that the meetings had been very enlightening. Although Council members might think that Concordia had no money and that life was very difficult and he would not disagree, as Dean, he had not been asked nor had Council members been asked to compress their budgets as had happened in every other province in this country. The Deans in most universities in Canada were told to compress their budgets by 5% for next year. Most Deans from the other provinces did not understand when Dean Bertrand said that he had new positions in the Faculty. Most of them were cutting positions or dropping faculty members, some had dropped as many as ten and although there was no increase in Concordia's operating budget for a couple of years, other deans had to cut up to 15% from their operating budgets. He reminded Council that the Quebec government had also equalized the funding formula for universities in the province. While life was not easy, by comparison, it was not all that bad either. Funding for higher education was becoming scarce and the fight for resources would be an ongoing reality. Thus far, the government of Quebec said it would not cut the budget and it kept its word this year.

12. Time and Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of Arts and Science Faculty Council will be held on May 21, 1991 at 9:30 a.m. in Room AD-131.

11. Adjournment

- 91-5M-6** It was moved and seconded (P. Albert/R. Perigoe) that the meeting be adjourned at 3:30 p.m.